

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The non-final Office Action dated March 18, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 1 and 26 have been amended, and claims 18, 20, 23, 25, 34 and 37 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-3, 6-14, 16-17, 19, 21-22, 24, 26-30, 32-33 and 35-36 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-14, 16-30, and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant notes the term “non-exposing material” has been identified in the Office Action as having “no clear meaning,” but has been assumed to mean “not patterned” for examining purposes. The Examiner is correct in assuming “non-exposing material” means a material that is not patterned by a photolithographic process. And, as disclosed on page 12 of Applicant’s specification, “the in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display uses a non-exposing type material as the overcoat layer.” Applicant has amended claims 1 and 26 to clarify the recited subject matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-14, 16-30 and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,208,399, issued to Ohta et al. (hereafter “the ‘399 patent”), or alternately, the associated PCT W098/47044, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,059, issued to Ohta et al. (hereafter “the ‘059 patent”). Applicant traverses the rejection because neither the ‘399 patent nor the ‘059 patent, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. For example, the ‘399 patent and the ‘059 patent fail to teach or suggest a method of manufacturing an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, forming an overcoat layer over the second substrate, curing the overcoat layer, the overcoat layer including a non-exposing material, using only a deposition and curing process, wherein the non-exposing material includes an epoxy acrylate based material and at least one of an amine based

Reply to non-final Office Action dated March 18, 2004

material, a benzophenone based material, an acetophenone based material and a triazine based material,” as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application.

Because the ‘399 patent and the ‘059 patent fail to teach or suggest at least this recited feature of claim 1, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-3, 6-14, 16, 17, 19, 21-22 and 24 are allowable over the ‘399 patent and the ‘059 patent. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Independent claim 26 is allowable over the ‘399 patent and the ‘059 patent because neither the ‘399 patent nor the ‘059 patent, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests a method of manufacturing a color filter substrate of a liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, “forming an overcoat layer over the second substrate including the light-shielding layer and the color filter, and curing the overcoat layer, the overcoat layer including a non-exposing material, using only a deposition and curing process, wherein the non-exposing material includes an epoxy acrylate based material and at least one of an amine based material, a benzophenone based material, an acetophenone based material and a triazine based material,” as recited in claim 26. Because the ‘399 patent and the ‘059 patent fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 26, claim 26 and its dependent claims 27-30, 32-33 and 35-36 are allowable over the ‘399 patent and the ‘059 patent. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

Application No.: 09/735,519
Amendment dated June 18, 2004

Docket No.: 8733.350.00-US

Reply to non-final Office Action dated March 18, 2004

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: June 18, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie Hayes
Valerie Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant